

**\*\*E-Filed 7/7/2011\*\***

David C. Powell (SBN 129781)  
 Email: dpowell@reedsmith.com  
 Heather B. Hoesterey (SBN 201254)  
 Email: hhoesterey@reedsmith.com  
 REED SMITH LLP  
 101 Second Street, Suite 1800  
 San Francisco, CA 94105-3659  
 Telephone: +1 415 543 8700  
 Facsimile: +1 415 391 8269

Attorneys for Defendant Merrill, Lynch, Pierce,  
 Fenner & Smith, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

ELWOOD QUESADA, JAMES DeROSA, and  
 Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

BANC OF AMERICA INVESTMENT  
 SERVICES, INC., NKA MERRILL LYNCH,  
 PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH, INC,

Defendant.

Case No. CV-11-01703 JF

**STIPULATED REQUEST AND  
~~{PROPOSED}~~ ORDER TO CONTINUE  
 CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Date: July 8, 2011  
 Time: 10:30 a.m.  
 Courtroom: 3

The Honorable Jeremy Fogel

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND REQUESTED, by and between Plaintiffs Elwood Quesada and James DeRosa (“collectively “Plaintiffs”) and defendant Banc of America Investment Services, Inc., now known as Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. (“Merrill Lynch”), through their respective attorneys of record, and based upon good cause, that the Court may make and issue its Order Continuing the Case Management Conference in this matter, currently set for 10: a.m. on July 8, 2011, until September 9, 2011, or such other date as the Court is available. Good cause exists for this request, as follows:

(1) On or about February 7, 2011 Plaintiffs filed a Complaint against Bank of America Corporation ("BAC") in the Superior Court for the State of California county of Santa Clara, case number 111CV193724. BAC removed the action to this court and filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint;

(2) In response to BAC's Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint on or about May 11, 2011. In the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs dismissed BAC and alleged claims against Merrill Lynch;

(3) On or about May 16, 2011 Merrill Lynch, by and through its counsel, executed a Waiver of Service of Summons of the Amended Complaint in this matter;

(4) The time for Merrill Lynch to respond to the Amended Complaint will not have run as of the July 8, 2011 date, Merrill Lynch will not have appeared, and the matter will not be at issue;

(5) Plaintiffs' counsel is unavailable on July 8, 2011.

(6) The parties request this continuance and believe there is good cause for this continuance because the parties believe a Rule 26(f) conference will be more efficient, the parties will be better able to assess the issues, and the parties will be able to present this Court with a more informative and reasoned report under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rules 16(b) and 26 and Local Rule 16-9 after Merrill Lynch has appeared in this action and responded to the Amended Complaint.

DATED: June 29, 2011

LAW OFFICES OF JON E. DRUCKER

By           / s / Jon E. Drucker            
Jon E. Drucker  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Elwood Quesada and James DeRosa

DATED: June 29, 2011

REED SMITH LLP

By           / s / Heather B. Hoesterey            
Heather B. Hoesterey  
Attorneys for Defendant Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.

**~~{PROPOSED}~~ ORDER**

Upon reading the above Stipulation, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Case Management Conference, currently set for 10:00 a.m. on July 8, 2011, is continued to September 9, 2011 at 10:30 a.m.

The Parties shall file their ADR Certification and Stipulation for ADR Process pursuant to local Rule 16-8 on or before August 26, 2011.

The Parties shall file their Joint Scheduling Conference Report Pursuant to Rule 26 and Joint Case Management Statement pursuant to Local Rule 16-9 on or before September 2, 2011.

DATED: 7/7/2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
THE HONORABLE E. J. FOGEL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE